



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,360	07/27/2001	Hiroshi Ishii	R2184.0123/P123	6987
24998	7590	12/02/2005	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			MILIA, MARK R	
2101 L Street, NW			ART UNIT	
Washington, DC 20037			PAPER NUMBER	

2622

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,360

Applicant(s)

ISHII ET AL.

Examiner

Mark R. Milia

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 9/16/05 and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-9 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, more specifically claims 1, 5, and 9, have been considered but are moot in view of the current amendments to the claims and therefore a new ground(s) of rejection will be made. The examiner agrees that the reference of Kawasaki does not disclose dividing compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions, recited in claims 1, 5, and 9, as currently amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Japanese Patent Document No. 11-095944 to Ishii. Reference will be made to a computer translation that is hereby attached.

Regarding claim 1, Kawasaki discloses an image processing device comprising: a dividing part which divides image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions without decompressing them in such a manner that each set of image drawing instructions can be processed without referring to any other set of image drawing instructions (see Fig. 6, column 4 lines 32-36, column 12 lines 20-25 and 40-47, column 15 lines 8-14, and column 16 lines 26-32), a distributing part which distributes the plurality of sets of image drawing instructions to a plurality of image production processing parts (see Fig. 4, column 10 line 64-column 11 line 4, column 11 lines 9-19 and 30-35, column 11 line 59-column 12 line 14, and column 16 lines 5-11), and said plurality of image production processing parts each of which generates drawing data for image drawing processing from the plurality of sets of image drawing instructions (see column 11 lines 30-40, column 11 line 59-column 12 line 14, and column 16 lines 12-20).

Kawasaki does not disclose expressly a dividing part which divides compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions.

Ishii discloses a dividing part which divides compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions (see abstract and paragraph [0024]).

Regarding claim 5, Kawasaki discloses an image processing method comprising the steps of: dividing image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets image drawing instructions without decompressing them in such a manner that each set of image drawing instructions can be processed without referring to any other set of image drawing instructions (see Fig. 6, column 4 lines 32-36, column 12 lines 20-25 and 40-47, column 15 lines 8-14, and column 16 lines 26-32) and generating drawing data for image drawing processing from the plurality of sets of image drawing instructions (see Fig. 4, column 10 line 64-column 11 line 4, column 11 lines 26-35, column 12 lines 5-11 and 59-63, column 13 lines 1-8 and 53-56, and column 16 lines 5-11).

Kawasaki does not disclose expressly dividing compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions.

Ishii discloses dividing compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions (see abstract and paragraph [0024]).

Regarding claim 9, Kawasaki discloses an image forming apparatus comprising: a dividing part which divides image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions without decompressing them in such a manner that each set of image drawing instructions can be processed without referring to any other set of image drawing instructions (see Fig. 6, column 4 lines 32-36, column 12 lines 20-25 and 40-47, column 15 lines 8-14, and column 16 lines 26-32), a distributing part which distributes the plurality of sets of image drawing instructions to a plurality of image production processing parts (see Fig. 4, column 10 line 64-column 11 line 4, column 11 lines 9-19 and 30-35, column 11 line 59-column 12 line 14, and column 16 lines 5-11),

said plurality of image production processing parts each of which generates drawing data for image drawing processing from the plurality of sets of image drawing instructions (see column 11 lines 30-40, column 11 line 59-column 12 line 14, and column 16 lines 12-20), and a drawing processing part which performs drawing processing according to drawing data given by said parts, and thus forms an image (see Fig. 1, column 8 lines 57-59, column 11 lines 37-41, and column 16 lines 26-32).

Kawasaki does not disclose expressly a dividing part which divides compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions.

Ishii discloses a dividing part which divides compressed image drawing instructions into a plurality of sets of image drawing instructions (see abstract and paragraph [0024]).

Kawasaki & Ishii are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, dividing image data for subsequent execution.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the dividing of a compressed image into a plurality of segments to be executed as described by Ishii with the system of Kawasaki.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to maintain image quality and to decrease the amount of required page memory.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishii with Kawasaki to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 5, and 9.

Regarding claims 2 and 6, Kawasaki and Ishii disclose the system discussed in claims 1 and 5, and Kawasaki further discloses wherein image data corresponding to the given image drawing instructions to be processed here comprises image data obtained through data compression such that the resulting image data comprises a plurality of data blocks and each data block can be decompressed without referring to any other data block (see Figs. 4 and 6, column 12 lines 20-25, 40-47, and 52-56, column 13 lines 1-8, 12-27, and 51-56, and column 15 lines 8-14, 17-26, and 29-40).

Regarding claims 3 and 7, Kawasaki and Ishii disclose the system discussed in claims 2 and 6, and Kawasaki further discloses wherein said dividing part divides given image data by a border between data blocks (see Figs. 6 and 7, column 15 lines 51-56, and column 20 line 6-column 21 line 24).

Regarding claims 4 and 8, Kawasaki and Ishii disclose the system discussed in claims 1 and 5, and further Kawasaki discloses wherein image data corresponding to the given image drawing instructions comprises image data obtained through data compression by a fixed length compressing method (see column 12 lines 40-56, column 12 line 58-column 13 line 27, column 15 lines 40-56, column 19 lines 28-36, and column 20 line 10-column 21 line 49, reference shows that data is divided into blocks of a predetermined size based on the size of the received image and then compressed based on this information and the compression is not started until the proper number of lines have been read reached which is analogous to a fixed-length compression method).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached at (571) 272-7402. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark R. Milia
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

MRM


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600